

Date: Sat, 30 Jan 93 04:30:20 PST
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #26
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Sat, 30 Jan 93 Volume 93 : Issue 26

Today's Topics:

 all of this closed repeater stuff
 My call sign : ((2 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 28 Jan 93 20:30:14 GMT
From: haven.umd.edu!darwin.sura.net!newsserver.jvnc.net!netnews.upenn.edu!
eniac.seas.upenn.edu!jfk@ames.arpa
Subject: all of this closed repeater stuff
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I must say, I was rather surprised to come back to this newsgroup
after a couple days absent to find 150 new messages with practically
the same subject. Needless to say, my interest was piqued, but now, I'm
not so sure it was all worth reading.

First, my opinion on the subject of closed repeaters:

 They're allowed - and they're legal. There's no rule that says you have
to let someone else use your station. There's only a rule that you may
not accept or require reimbursement for the use of your station. Now
club run repeaters...and even people run repeaters don't fall under the rule of
accepting or requiring reimbursement because they're made up of amateurs
cooperating on "co-owning" a station. People may disagree with me, but
such club dues for repeaters are perfectly reasonable for a station you
have an investment in (seriously, how many clubs have ONE person owning a

repeater? usually, it's the entire club...the club itself).

Now, while closed repeaters may be legal - and I can even see justification from a certain twisted viewpoint for their inception (though I refuse to go into that here) - I find it hard to see how they fit into the spirit of amateur radio. I mean, amateur radio is primarily a public service. Our primary charter is to be trained and prepared to provide communications in state of emergency. Beyond that, amateur radio was supposed to be a fun (whether serious or not) hobby in which we as members of that community enjoyed sharing information, experiences and resources (to a limited extent) with each other. In light of this feeling of comraderie, how is it we find ourselves with closed repeaters?

The line is thin indeed. And as evidenced from this last set of sometimes hilarious and sometimes not so hilarious flamethrowing messages, I can see that we're all walking it.

I find the legal issues discussed quite interesting...though wish to make no comment on it now. And I'm not even going to touch the SoCal thing with a 40 foot tower - as there are many conflicting reports and it sounds like it's a system that needs reevaluating - from within - and from without.

Now, as for the flamethrowing. At risk of being put on Mr. Maynard's personal hit list - I offer this advice:

- If you have nothing good to say - then silence is usually best - heck, silence is usually more powerful than words.

- And if you must express your feelings - don't waste bandwidth - use email;)

I agree with Mr Maynard's distaste at the "jammer". I too agree that anyone who has to resort to that sort of tactic is the lowest of hams. And I don't think that any qualifications made for jamming - such as operating on a closed repeater, or QRM'ing a transmission - is any excuse. Simply put, if you're interfering with someone else's station - which includes the unauthorized use of it - you are at fault. I don't think there should be unauthorized repeaters - but there are...and common curtesy from our side (two wrongs don't make a right) would be to steer clear of closed repeaters unless you want to become a member.

Mr Maynard - though I'm not personally offended by your use of bad language - I can tell you this - it resulted in a wide waste of bandwidth. Why, I counted at least 20 messages referring to that particular subject. And for those who wished to carry on about Mr Maynard's behavior, well, you're in the same boat with him. I understand flame wars pop up from time to time - but it really gets ridiculous (and please....flames to /dev/null or 131.8 Hz - or my private mailbox). That sort of thing - is best done in

private....if at all. Heck, this portion of my mail could be considered waste of bandwidth...but I might as well join the fun:) (I am not greater than my own shit heap;)

I am no great saint at not calling the kettle black. But I do know this - the majority of the last 150 or so messages have put a sad feeling into my heart. The feeling that we as a community of respected colleagues in Amateur Radio have degraded into a bunch of petty beaureaucrats who have forgotten what being a Ham is all about.

--Soapbox off---

Private replies welcome...as well as tasteful public ones;) I'll summarize the flames for people who are interested;)

73's - in the true sense of the meaning,
James - KB8DPV

--

James F. Kennedy jfk@ee.upenn.edu
University of Pennsylvania jfk@seas.upenn.edu
N3KZ ARC 146.685- and 442.700+(pl 131.8)
"These are my opinions - I make no apology for that."
"Tact: The UNSAID part of what you are thinking."

Date: Thu, 28 Jan 1993 22:11:45 GMT
From: pa.dec.com!engage.pko.dec.com!nnnpd.lkg.dec.com!nnnpd2.cxo.dec.com!
32799.enet.dec.com!yanagi@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: My call sign : (
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

My wife passed her test on 10/20/92 and got her license 1/2/93, so mid-February would be a reasonable guess.

Good luck (and hang in there - I've been through your desperation!)

73,
John N2KJM

Date: 29 Jan 93 05:40:24 GMT
From: munnari.oz.au!spool.mu.edu!hri.com!ukma!miles@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: My call sign : (
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

yanagi@32799.enet.dec.com (32799::yanagi) writes:

> My wife passed her test on 10/20/92 and got her license 1/2/93, so
> mid-February would be a reasonable guess.
> Good luck (and hang in there - I've been through your desperation!)
> John N2KJM

Whaaaa! This sucks! I've had my DJ580 for weeks and weeks and no license yet! I've not experienced the pleasure of "trasmission" (except for those occasional (purely accidental, mind you) blips on the PTT button that trigger the oh-so-sweet sounding repeater ID. ;). I took my test 12.2 I believe. Nothing yet. :(

Date: 28 Jan 1993 20:59:51 GMT
From: usc!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!The-Star.honeywell.com!umn.edu!gaia.ucs.orst.edu!
ruby!stanley@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <8573@lib.tmc.edu>, <Jan27.214742.55990@yuma.ACNS.ColoState.EDU>,
<8583@lib.tmc.edu>orst
Subject : Re: Language on the net (was Re: Closed repeaters)

In article <8583@lib.tmc.edu> jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu (Jay Maynard) writes:
>Hardly; after all, if my vocabulary is as limited as you claim, then I must
>soon run out of things to say.

We've noticed. You just keep saying the same limited things over and over.

>You're no better than the second vice president; Julian Macassey and John
>Stanley beat you to it by quite a bit. I routinely ignore both.

Jay, I am constantly amazed at your ability to hold a grudge. Especially over something as trivial as news.

Date: Fri, 29 Jan 1993 16:27:18 GMT
From: gatech!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!howland.reston.ans.net!zaphod.mps.ohio-
state.edu!news.acns.nwu.edu!casbah.acns.nwu.edu!rdewan@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jan27.090717.2148@guvax.acc.georgetown.edu>,
<1993Jan28.211130.16685@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com>, <C1Lp3D.6v8@ms.uky.edu>s.
Subject : Re: My call sign : (

In article <C1Lp3D.6v8@ms.uky.edu> miles@ms.uky.edu (Stephen D. Grant) writes:

>yanagi@32799.enet.dec.com (32799::yanagi) writes:

>

>> My wife passed her test on 10/20/92 and got her license 1/2/93, so

>> mid-February would be a reasonable guess.

>> Good luck (and hang in there - I've been through your desperation!)

>> John N2KJM

>

> Whaaaaa! This sucks! I've had my DJ580 for weeks and weeks and no license yet!

> I've not experienced the pleasure of "trasmission" (except for those occasional

> (purely accidental, mind you) blips on the PTT button that trigger the oh-so-

> sweet sounding repeater ID. ;). I took my test 12.2 I believe. Nothing yet. :(

^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^

Yes. CW is sweet isn't it. CU on the cw bands.

Rajiv

aa9ch

Address: r-dewan@nwu.edu

Phone: None. Only CW.

Date: 28 Jan 1993 23:29:51 GMT

From: sun-barr!news2me.EBay.Sun.COM!west.West.Sun.COM!l1-a!flloyd@ames.arpa

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <Jan28.150743.70665@yuma.ACNS.ColoState.EDU>,

<1k95ndINNnsu@tamsun.tamu.edu>, <Jan28.203419.33501@yuma.ACNS.ColoState.EDU>=

Subject : Re: Language on the net (was Re: Closed repeaters)

Jay, Kurt and Galen:

Why don't you boys take this crap private. Nobody else cares.

-fred

--

[Fred Lloyd, AA7BQ

Fred.Lloyd@West.Sun.COM]

[Sun Microsystems,

Southwest Area Solaris Transition Manager]

[Phoenix, AZ

(602) 275-4242]

Date: Fri, 29 Jan 93 19:36:05 GMT

From: mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx!rcanders@uunet.uu.net

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jan27.171046.29725@netcon.smc.edu>,
<1k7fuoINNinm@tamsun.tamu.edu>, <1993Jan29.002812.28339@netcon.smc.edu>
Subject : Re: Closed repeaters (FCC wants them open)

The basic issue on the open-closed repeater discussion is not if a person can limit the use of their repeater but can an individual or organization OWN frequencies and prevent others from using frequencies in the ham bands.

If an organization or person puts up a closed repeater and demands exclusive rights to the frequency pair they are claiming ownership to the frequency. If they consider anyone who uses their frequencies as a jammer they are clamming ownership. If they will not permit any else to put a repeater on their frequency they are clamming ownership. If they charge a fee for the use of their repeater they are charging for the use of the amateur radio frequencies.

If repeaters shared frequencies or any one could put up an open repeater on any frequency there would be no problem. But when there are no open repeaters and no more frequency pairs for additional repeaters, and the closed repeaters in the area are charging \$300 a year isn't this the same as charging for the use of the ham band?

It is interesting when there was a big discussion of using a auto patch to order a pizza was improper business use of ham radio. Now some hams are claiming a right to charge for the use of their frequencies.

The argument is not about giving any one the right to use your equipment (repeater) but instead is does anyone has the right to set up a private repeater and DENY any one else the right to use the frequencies the repeater occupies. It is one thing to deny me the right to use of your equipment but another thing to deny me the right to use a frequency just because you have dormant equipment (a repeater not in use) on that frequency.

73

--

Rod Anderson	N0NZO	A life consisting exclusively of things
Boulder, CO		that are Good for You is bad for you.
rcanders@nyx.cs.du.edu		Kelvin Throop
satellite	N0NZO on ao-16	

Date: 29 Jan 93 00:28:12 GMT
From: netcomsv!bongo!netcon!agood@decwrl.dec.com
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <8558@lib.tmc.edu>, <1993Jan27.171046.29725@netcon.smc.edu>,
<1k7fuoINNinm@tamsun.tamu.edu>
Subject : Re: Closed repeaters (FCC wants them open)

In article <1k7fuoINNinm@tamsun.tamu.edu> willis@cs.tamu.edu (Willis Marti) writes:
>In article <1993Jan27.171046.29725@netcon.smc.edu> agood@netcon.smc.edu (Aaron Good) writes:
>[a lot of stuff about there being a lot of closed repeaters in his area
> that want, in his NSHO, too much \$\$ for membership]

I never said I was humble, just ticked off about the old boy network of closed repeaters.
It's too bad you just wrote off all my "stuff" about the closed repeaters serving the elite few>

>
>2. Are there no open repeaters in your area? I'd be surprised, despite
>the apparent number of closed repeaters. If there are open repeaters,
>why do you *need* more? What's the purpose of putting up another in the
>same band besides vanity?

The Southern Calif area is a very large geographical area with an extremely varied terrain. Many free repeaters do not cover areas needed by those Hams unfortunate enough not to have a few extra grand floating around to join a couple of repeater groups. The *need* is to cover reliably, areas of varying topology and building densities.

>
>3. If there really are money making repeater 'clubs', how much effort have
>you put into changing it through your local organizations?

The reason why no one dares to take these people on is that many are the "establishment" of the local organizations. Alot of these people have built up long standing relationships with politicians, regulatory people, and other movers and shakers. It would not be in one's best interest to attack someone who can hire an extremely expensive Beverly Hills lawyer to come after you. In fact we had a case just recently reported in W5YI, where at least one of the individuals involved hired a very poerful attorney in Washington D.C. to take care of the allegations that were made.

Maybe in other parts of the country people don't sue each other as much, but in LA LA land, if you are wealthy enough to support a multi-site linked

repeatersystem with HF remotes, you're almost certain to have a family lawyer
who'll
sue the Joe who makes any damaging allegations against you.

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #26
